

REMARKS

Claims 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 21, 22, 23, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, and 45 were pending in the application at the time of examination.

The Examiner rejected Claims 4, 21, 32 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the Torborg reference (US 005936616A) in view of the Smith reference (US 005212770A).

The Examiner rejected Claims 5 to 7, 22 and 33 to 35 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the Torborg reference (US 005936616A) in view of the Smith reference (US 005212770A) and further in view of Tasfe (US 005179651A).

The Examiner objected to Claims 8, 9, 10, 23, 36 and 37 for being dependent upon a rejected base claim but indicated these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have cancelled, without prejudice, Claims 4, 21, 32 and 45 and Claims 5, 6, 7, 22, 33, 34 and 35. Applicants have amended Claims 8, 23 and 36 to place the parent claims in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Consequently, Claims 8, 9, 10, 23, 36 and 37 remain in the Application.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 4, 21, 32 AND 45

The Examiner rejected Claims 4, 21, 32 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the Torborg reference (US 005936616A) in view of the Smith reference (US 005212770A).

Applicants have cancelled, without prejudice, Claims 4, 21, 32 and 45 and Claims 5, 6, 7, 22, 33, 34 and 35.

Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 4, 21, 32 and 45 is now moot.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 5 TO 7, 22 AND 33 TO 35

The Examiner rejected Claims 5 to 7, 22, and 33 to 35 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the Torborg reference (US 005936616A) in view of the Smith reference (US 005212770A) and further in view of Tasfe (US 005179651A).

Applicants have cancelled, without prejudice, Claims 4, 21, 32 and 45 and Claims 5, 6, 7, 22, 33, 34 and 35. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 5, 6, 7, 22, 33, 34 and 35 is now moot.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner objected to Claims 8, 9, 10, 23, 36 and 37 for being dependent upon a rejected base claim but indicated these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have amended Claim 8 to place Claim 8 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim (Claim 4) and any intervening claims (Claims 5, 6, and 7).

Applicants have amended Claim 23 to place Claim 23 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim (Claim 21) and any intervening claims (Claims 21 and 22).

Applicants have amended Claim 36 to place Claim 36 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim (Claim 32) and any intervening claims (Claims 33, 34 and 35).

In addition, Claims 9 and 10 depend, directly or indirectly on Claim 8, as amended, and Claim 37 depends on Claim 36, as amended.

In light of the amendments to Claims 8, 23 and 36, and the Examiner's comments, Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 8, 9, 10, 23, 36 and 37, as amended.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicants.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on November 21, 2005.



Attorney for Applicants

November 21, 2005
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Philip J. McKay
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,966
Tel.: (831) 655-0880